



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

learned from the Apostles, which, also, he handed down to the Church. He persevered steadily to the end, and in the extremity of old age he departed this life, having suffered martyrdom in the most glorious and conspicuous manner."

The statement here given by Irenæus that Polycarp was made Bishop of Smyrna by the Apostles is repeated from him by Eusebius and other writers; and Tertullian adds the additional fact, that St. John was the Apostle by whom the appointment was made.* This fact is particularly deserving of notice, if the conclusion drawn from it by Archbishop Usher be true—namely, that Polycarp was the angel, or Bishop of the Church at Smyrna, to whom St. John was commissioned to address the message recorded in the second chapter of the Revelation. Indeed, if we bear in mind that this book was written not long before the Apostle's death, and that Polycarp, as we have seen, was appointed Bishop of the Church at Smyrna by St. John, and certainly survived him for many years, it seems by no means improbable that Polycarp was actually Bishop of the Church at Smyrna when the Revelation was composed; and if so, he was certainly the angel to whom St. John was commissioned to address these words, "And unto the angel of the Church in Smyrna write: These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive, I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty; but thou art rich. Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: I know faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Rev. ii. 8, seq.). If this prediction was really addressed to Polycarp, we shall presently see that it was minutely and strikingly fulfilled.

Not many years after St. John's death, when the persecution of Trajan against the Christians began to be enforced, Ignatius the Bishop of Antioch was condemned by the Emperor, and sentenced to be brought to Rome, in order to be executed. In his voyage thither he touched at Smyrna, to salute and converse with Polycarp; and there, as we have reason to believe, these good and faithful men mutually comforted and encouraged each other, under the trials to which they were severally exposed. From Smyrna Ignatius and his company sailed to Troas, from which place he sent back an Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, wherein he endeavours to warn them against some of the errors of the times which had crept in amongst them; and besides this he wrote particularly to Polycarp, commending the Church of Antioch to his care. From this date (A.D. 107) we hear nothing of Polycarp for many years, until an unhappy dissension which arose in the Church brought him again prominently forward.

The difference in question arose about the exact day on which the festival of Easter should be observed, and about the manner of observing the Easter fast. Upon this point the Eastern and Western Churches were divided in opinion; and each justified its practice by apostolic tradition.† In order to appease this dissension if possible, Polycarp, about A.D. 158, undertook a journey to Rome. Anicetus was then Bishop of that see, and the account which Irenæus (who, we have seen, was a disciple of Polycarp) gives of the result of their interview is extremely remarkable. The passage is quoted as follows by the historian Eusebius:‡

"The difference in our fasting establishes the unanimity of our faith.... When Polycarp of blessed memory came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, and there had been a small controversy between them concerning some other things, they straightway mutually embraced each other, having no desire to dispute much with one another about this matter. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it [the Easter fast] because he had always kept it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had been conversant; nor did Polycarp induce Anicetus not to observe it, who said, that he ought to retain the usages of the presbyters that were his predecessors. Which things being so, they received the communion together. And Anicetus permitted Polycarp (from an honourable respect for him) to consecrate the Sacrament in his own Church; and they parted peaceably one from another; both those who observed it [the fast] and those who observed it not retaining the peace and communion of the whole Church."

The entire of this narrative is singularly instructive. It not only sets forth, in a very striking light, the mingled firmness and moderation of Polycarp, but it likewise enables us to form a just estimate of the true position occupied by the Bishop of Rome in those days. We hear nothing of the infallibility of the Pope, as successor of St. Peter; nothing of his supreme authority to rule and govern the universal Church. Polycarp and

Anicetus meet on terms of absolute equality; they mutually endeavour each to alter the other's opinion; and when neither could succeed, they agree to differ, and, in the words of the historian: "they parted peaceably one from another." It would have been well for the peace and harmony of the Christian world if the popes had always been influenced by the same spirit of moderation and forbearance.

The days of the good bishop Polycarp were now, however, drawing to a close. In the year 166, the persecution of the Christians under Marcus Aurelius Antoninus commenced, and in a little while it raged with the greatest violence throughout Asia Minor. The letter is still extant in which the sorrowing Church of Smyrna relates to the Christian community at Philomelium the manner of Polycarp's death. The antiquity of this letter, no less than the touching character of the scene which it describes, combine to render it one of the most remarkable documents in the whole range of ecclesiastical history. We must content ourselves with a brief outline of the events which it details.

Polycarp, during the persecution at Smyrna, had been urged by his friends to retire to a neighbouring village, where he passed the greater part of his time in prayer. Here three days before his apprehension, he had a remarkable dream, which his anticipation of his fate led him to interpret as an intimation that he should be burnt alive, a foreboding but too exactly verified by the event. After many Christians in Smyrna had sealed their testimony with their blood, the cry rose among the infuriated populace, "Away with the Atheists! let Polycarp be apprehended." His place of concealment was betrayed by two slaves, who were forced by torture to confess it. When the officers arrived, Polycarp calmly said, "The will of the Lord be done;" and after spending two hours in prayer, he was conducted to the city. He was met by Herod, the chief magistrate, and his father Nicetas, who took him into their own carriage, and vainly endeavoured to persuade him to submit to the two tests usually proposed to the Christians, namely, to acknowledge the emperor as Lord, and to offer sacrifice. On his determined refusal he was hastily thrust out of the chariot, and conducted to the theatre, the benches of which, rising one above another, were crowded with frantic spectators.

The proconsul, Stratius Quadratus, appeared touched with pity for the venerable bishop, and urged him to deny the Christian faith. "Beard," saith he, "thy great awe; swear by the genius of Cæsar; swear, and I will release thee; blaspheme Christ." The proposal was rejected with indignant scorn. "Eighty and six years," said Polycarp, "have I served Christ, and He has never done me an injury; how can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?" The proconsul threatened to expose him to the wild beasts. He replied again, "It is well for me to be speedily released from this life of misery." The proconsul threatened to burn him alive. He replied once more, "I fear not the fire that burns for a moment; thou knowest not that which burns for ever and ever." His countenance was full of peace and joy, even when the herald advanced into the midst of the assemblage, and thrice proclaimed, "Polycarp has professed himself a Christian."

A general cry arose among the populace, that the bishop should be burned alive. The Jews were as vindictively active as the heathen in collecting the fuel of the baths and other combustibles, to raise up a hasty, yet capacious, funeral pile. The venerable martyr was speedily bound to the stake; and then offered up the following simple and touching prayer:

"O Lord God Almighty, the Father of Thy well-beloved and ever blessed son Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the knowledge of Thee; the God of angels, powers, and of every creature, and of the whole race of the righteous who live before Thee; I bless Thee that thou hast graciously thought me worthy of this day and this hour, that I may receive a portion in the number of Thy martyrs, and drink of Christ's cup, for the resurrection to eternal life both of body and soul, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit; among whom may I be admitted this day, as a pure and acceptable sacrifice, as Thou, O true and faithful God, has prepared and fore-shown and accomplished. Wherefore I praise thee for all Thy mercies, I bless thee, I glorify thee, with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, to whom with Thee and the Holy Spirit be glory now and ever."

The fire was kindled by the executioners; but the flames arose around the pious martyr, curving like an arch, or like a sail swelling with the wind, leaving his body unharmed. A spearman was sent in to dispatch the sufferer: his side was pierced, and blood enough

flowed from his aged body to extinguish the flames immediately around him.

The malice of the enemies of Polycarp did not end with his death. His friends and followers were anxious to give the remains of the martyr an honourable burial, but the Jews and others advised the proconsul not to bestow his body on the Christians, lest leaving their Divine Master, they should henceforth worship Polycarp. This calumnious charge is repelled with scorn in the letter of the Church of Smyrna (from which the entire narrative is taken), in the following emphatic words: "They little consider how impossible it is that either we should forsake Christ, who died for the salvation of the whole world, or that we should ever worship any other. For we adore Him as being the Son of God; but martyrs as the disciples and followers of our Lord, we deservedly love for their eminent kindness towards their own Prince and Master, whose companions and fellow-disciples we also by all means desire to be." Nothing can be clearer than this testimony to prove how far removed those pious and primitive Christians were from that undue and superstitious veneration of the relics of martyrs and departed saints, which after ages introduced into the Church.

Some of the circumstances introduced into the foregoing narrative, as well as other incidents contained in the letter of the Church of Smyrna, may seem to verge on the supernatural; but they are no more than may be ascribed to the high-wrought imagination of the Christian spectators deepening every incident into a wonder. The whole narrative has the simple energy of truth. The prudent, yet resolute conduct of the aged bishop—the expostulation of the governor—the brutal fury of the populace—the Jews eagerly seizing the opportunity of testifying their hatred to the Christian name: all are simply yet vividly portrayed. And if we are right in identifying Polycarp with the angel of the Church of Smyrna in the Apocalypse, we cannot but be struck with the exact conformity between the prophecy and the fulfillment. "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer; behold the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; be thou faithful unto death: and I will give thee a crown of life."

We conclude in the words of the ancient document, to which we have so often referred.

"Thus far concerning the blessed Polycarp. Eleven brethren from Philadelphia suffered with him, but he alone is particularly celebrated by all. Even by Gentiles he is spoken of in every place. He was in truth, not only an illustrious teacher, but also an eminent writer, whose martyrdom all desire to imitate, because it was regulated exactly by evangelical principles. For by patience he conquered the unjust magistrate; and thus receiving the crown of immortality, and exulting with apostles and all the righteous, he glorifies God, even the Father, and blesses our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of our souls and the Ruler of our bodies, and the Shepherd of the universal Church throughout the world!"

PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

Of all the controversies with the Church of Rome which have been discussed in our pages, the question concerning the use of private judgment is, in one sense, the most important; for if this question were decided against us, it would be no use to us to obtain a victory on all the rest. What advantage would it be to prove to the satisfaction of our readers that, according to our private judgment and theirs, there was no such place as purgatory, no such thing as transubstantiation, that we ought not to use invocation of saints, and so forth, if, after all, we had to own that neither we nor they had any right to use our private judgment at all?

It is well for us that the principle which is of such vital importance in this controversy is also the easiest to establish. We might say a good deal about the right of private judgment, and something more as to the duty of private judgment, but we think it enough now to prove the necessity of private judgment. We use our private judgment because we cannot help it. All the choice we have got is, whether we shall exercise our private judgment in one single act or in a great many; but exercise it one way or other we must. We may either apply our private judgment separately to the different questions in controversy, purgatory, transubstantiation, invocation of saints, &c., and come to our own conclusion on each; or we may apply our private judgment to the question whether the Church is infallible, and if we decide that it is, then take all the rest of our opinions on trust from the priest. But it is clear that we cannot be certain that any of these opinions are right unless our private judgment has decided the question rightly whether we ought to submit implicitly to the Church; and this is just as hard as any question in the controversy. It is just as if we had the disposal of a large sum of money. We might lay it out ourselves on the various objects which we judged fit; or we might give it away in one lump sum to somebody else; but that is all the choice we have. If the money is once in our hands we cannot avoid deciding, either by one single act of our judgment or by a great many, which shall be the next hands it shall get into.

People don't like private judgment because they don't

* Irenæus, adv. Hæc. lib. iii., c. lli., p. 203, Oxon. 1702.

† Hæc enim modo ecclesie apostolicæ consensu sunt definitæ; sicut Smyrnonum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Irenæo confortatus refert. Tertull. de præsc. Hæc. cap. xxviii., p. 212. Paris. 1675.

‡ Vide Care. Life of Polycarp, p. 111. London, 1677. Gold. Patr. Apost., vol. ii., p. 198. Note Amstel. 1794.

§ This is one example among several that might be readily adduced, how liable tradition is to be corrupted in the lapse of time. If all the Apostles actually observed Easter upon the same day, how did it come to pass that in the short space of a century the eastern, Eastern and Western Churches adopted different usages, and each pleaded apostolic authority? It is plain that both could not be right.

¶ Smith. Hist. lib. v. cap. 24.

§ Our readers, we doubt not, will observe that throughout the entire of this prayer, one of the most ancient and valuable memorials of the worship of the primitive Church, there is not the slightest allusion to the Virgin Mary, and no address or petition to saints or angels. We ask our Roman Catholic friends to attend particularly to this circumstance. Could Polycarp have omitted all mention of the Virgin Mary if he had believed (as the present Pope Pius IX. wrote in his Encyclical Letter of Feb. 2, 1854) that "God hath placed the plenitude of all good in her in such a manner, that if there be in us any hope, if there be any spiritual health, we know that it is from her that we receive it, because such is the will of Him who hath united that we should have all by the instrumentality of Mary (quia sic est voluntas ejus, qui totum nos habere voluit per Mariam)?"

† Vide Eusebius Eccl. Hist., lib. iv., cap. 16.

like responsibility, and they fancy that they can shake off the responsibility by parting with the exercise of their private judgment; but the truth is, that we must use our private judgment in one shape or other, and that we cannot shake off the responsibility. Suppose that a man were left heir to a large estate, and that he thought it too great a responsibility to undertake the management of it himself, and to decide for himself in each case what was to be done for each of his tenants and labourers, he might, no doubt, appoint an agent to act for him. By so doing he saves himself the trouble of exercising his private judgment in each particular case, and by one single act of his will determines to adopt the agent's view of every matter; but he does not get rid of his responsibility. If the agent be grasping and tyrannical, if he oppress the tenants and if the landlord refuse to inquire into any point for himself, but adopt without examination the agent's opinions, then the landlord is responsible for any injustice that may be done just as much as if he did it himself.

When we have got a difficult question to decide it is a very good thing to take advice; but then we must decide by our own private judgment whose advice we shall take, and we must take the responsibility ourselves of acting on that advice. This is true, even when the questions to be decided are quite beyond the powers of our own unassisted judgment. If we had a difficult law-suit to conduct, every one would tell us not to attempt to conduct it by our own private judgment, but to put it into the hands of some skilful lawyer; but then we must decide for ourselves and by our own private judgment into whose hands we shall put it. Perhaps we may not feel ourselves competent to decide even this for ourselves, and may leave the choice of the lawyer to our attorney; but then we have to choose for ourselves who shall be the attorney by whom we are to be directed. If we find even this too hard for us, we may ask some friend to pick us out an honest attorney, but then we have to decide for ourselves what friend's advice we shall take. Put off the decision as we please, it is in the end an act of our own judgment that must decide the whole conduct of the case. If we begin by taking the advice of an injudicious friend, or if the friend direct us to a roguish attorney, or if the attorney put our case into the hands of an incompetent lawyer, our case is mismanaged all the same. And the responsibility is ours; it is *we* who must take the consequences; it is *our* cause that is lost, if anything goes wrong. The short of the matter is, that both in our temporal and eternal concerns, God has given us a power of choice and of deciding what course we shall take, and we cannot escape the responsibility which attends our choice. It may be wise to direct our judgment by taking the advice of others, but if we choose for ourselves bad advisers, and follow their advice without examination, the act is ours, and we must take the consequences, just as much as if we had examined into the whole question for ourselves.

There was, some years ago, a bridge in Bath so crazy that cautious persons did not like to venture on it; once on a time an old lady, being anxious to get across in a hurry, and yet not liking to trust her weight upon the bridge, hit upon the ingenious contrivance of being carried across in a sedan chair. By this plan she gained the advantage of *not seeing* the danger, but the bridge had to bear her own weight and that of the chair and bearers into the bargain.

This is precisely what those do who, through distrust of their private judgment, put themselves under the guidance of some one regarded as infallible. They will not trust their private judgment to decide the questions of purgatory, transubstantiation, image worship, &c., and yet they form opinions on every one of these subjects, by first making their private judgment decide the question of their guide's infallibility, and then adopting in a lump his views on all the disputed questions. So private judgment is the bridge, and the infallible guide the sedan chair. And it is plain that the private judgment has a heavier weight to bear than if it acted without the infallible guide; for they have as much chance of being wrong as before about all the separate questions, purgatory, invocation of saints, and so forth, and they have the chance of being wrong about their guide's infallibility into the bargain.

If a man who felt himself encumbered with a number of small debts were to borrow from a money lender a sum sufficient to pay them off, but at an usurious interest, and should then feel quite at his ease and happy in having got rid of his incumbrances, would not every one say he had acted a very silly part? He would have only substituted one heavy debt for many small ones, and in the end would have to pay more for that "accommodation," as the usurer would call it, than if he had patiently worked through his original difficulties. Now, borrowing the authority of a supposed infallible guide to decide for us is really making ourselves responsible at once for each of his decisions to which we thus promise submission, and, besides that, for submitting to him at all. We shall have to answer to the Almighty still for every error we adopt on our guide's authority, and, furthermore, for bowing to his guidance without good proof of his legitimate authority.

We can give further proofs that there is no getting rid of private judgment. We must exercise it not only in

our first choice of a guide, but also (since it is impossible that the guide can settle *every* question) in forming our opinion about all the questions which the guide has not decided. If the infallible Church settles five hundred questions, there must still be private judgment and disputes about the five hundred and first. So it is that the Roman Catholic Church has been as full of disputes as any Protestant community. A couple of hundred years ago they wrangled violently as to whether the Virgin Mary was conceived without sin or not. That question is at rest now. In our last number we had one priest asserting that it is heresy to maintain "that the name of Mary is sweet and the name of Jesus bitter to a sinner;" while another priest held that the words contain sound doctrine. And if the infallible guide should settle this question, too, other questions would arise; and so it must be to the end of time.

But a Roman Catholic may reply, "I know that I must exercise my private judgment in some shape or other, but I wish to do so in religious matters in the same way in which I exercise it in temporal matters. If I have to go to sea, I know I must exercise my judgment in choosing a good ship, experienced sailors, and a skilful captain; but there my private judgment ends. I do not undertake the navigation of the vessel; but when once I have put myself into the captain's hands I allow him to conduct me as he thinks best. If I am ill, I use my private judgment in the choice of a physician; but, then, I submit implicitly to his directions. If I have to go to law, I use my private judgment in the choice of my legal advisers; but, then, I leave everything to them; and this is the way I manage in every other matter. Why, then, should I not do the same in religious matters, too, and having once for all used my private judgment in the choice of my clergy, submit myself, from that time out, implicitly to their direction."

We have two things to say in reply to this:—In the first place, in these cases where we make one act of our private judgment final, there is the more necessity for taking good care that we make this one decision rightly. If a number of persons tell us that the captain of the ship in which we are thinking of sailing is incompetent; or that the physician we are about to employ is a quack, or our attorney a rogue, we shall do well to look very sharp before we entrust ourselves to them without reserve. And this is just the case in the present instance; more than half the Christian world reject the claims of the Bishop of Rome to be infallible. All the Eastern Church, from the commencement of Christianity to the present day, has refused to admit them. The English Church, with all its widely extended and rapidly multiplying sister Churches in Scotland, America, and the Colonies, refuse to admit them. We have given abundant evidence in this paper that for all the first and purest centuries of Christian history no such claims were heard of. If, then, our Roman Catholic friends do not intend to exercise their private judgment on any other question, they ought to do so most carefully on this question, the most important of all, whether the guide whom they trust is infallible or not? And yet, from having got the notion into their heads that they are to examine for themselves into *nothing*, they take upon trust, too, this preliminary question, whether their guide be competent or not; and are inclined to lose their temper rather than to argue, when Protestants point out to them the mistake their guide has made, and his want of trustworthy credentials for his office.

In the second place, there is another great difference between religious matters and the other cases brought forward in our Roman Catholic friend's illustration. Man is not a navigating animal, or a fighting animal, or a litigating animal; and so it is not every one's business to be a sailor, or a soldier, or a lawyer; but it is every one's business to learn religion and to know the appointed way of gaining the favour of Almighty God. When we go into a ship we don't go into it to be taught navigation, but only to be carried to our journey's end the quickest way. When we entrust a case to a lawyer we do not want him to teach us law, but only to gain our suit for us in the best way he can. Now, this is not the case with religion, although ignorant people are apt to fancy so, and many men, no doubt, would like to have it so. It would give them a great deal less trouble if, instead of being religious themselves, they could go to a clergyman and get him to do something for them. This way of going to heaven by proxy is simply impossible. We insist strongly on the benefits conferred by the Church, and the advantages to be derived from her clergy; but we say that their office is to *teach* us religion, and not to learn it themselves, in our place. And the relation in which we stand to them is not that of a patient to a physician, but of a medical student to his teacher; and not that of a client to a lawyer, but that of a law pupil to the instructor under whom he is placed. And the way to profit by such instructions is not blindly to swallow remedies, not to receive directions unthinkingly, but to understand the reasons for them; and, instead of getting rid of our private judgment, to inform and improve our judgment by the best instruction that can be had.

Roman Catholics are thought to venerate their priests more than Protestants do, but the truth is that the position which Protestants assign their clergy is that which does them most real honour. You do more real honour

to the man whom you employ to *teach* you his art, than you do to the man whom you pay for exercising his art for you. When Lord Chesterfield heard that his son was learning to play the violin, he wrote to him very angrily on hearing of so degrading a pursuit; if you want music, said he, why don't you pay a man to fiddle for you. It is evident which he or his son paid most real honour to the musical profession. Now, we have known cases of educated Roman Catholics who spoke with the utmost contempt of their priest; but who yet, if they were dying, would, as a matter of course, send for the same priest, in implicit reliance on what the priest was to do for them. By such reliance they pay one kind of honour to their clergyman, but not such real honour as the Protestant who comes to *learn* from his clergyman, and instead of regarding his directions as matters in which his own reason and judgment are no way concerned, employs his Church's instructions to assist and direct his judgment, not to supersede it. The Protestant is like the medical student who looks up to the able lecturer from whom he receives instruction, to the excellence of which his own judgment and experience afford him constant confirmation; the Roman Catholic is like the ignorant peasant who receives without examination remedies which he imagines will have some magical virtue, because given him by the seventh son of a seventh son.

Which of these views is the right one, is a point which in the end our private judgment must decide; and we, therefore, ask our Roman Catholic friends to remember that the difference between them and us is not that we use our private judgment, and they do not; but that we use our private judgment on each question separately, of course guiding our judgment by all the means of human instruction within our reach; while they use their private judgment on all questions in a lump, and settle everything once for all by blindly accepting the infallibility of the Church of Rome. Let them remember, then, the great importance of deciding this one question rightly, and the great responsibility which attends their coming to a right decision. Whatever other questions discussed in our pages they may pass without notice, this one requires their most earnest attention; for they will be without excuse in the sight of God if they pin their whole faith on the right decision of the question whose guidance they are to follow, and if they refuse once to look into the evidence, whether or not the guide whom they follow be a deceiver.

THE UNANIMITY OF SPAIN.

If we were to venture an opinion as to what argument in favour of the Church of Rome's being the true Church was, at the same time, the most fallacious and delusive in its nature, and the most practically effective with the greater number of its adherents, we should say that it was the argument from numbers. Few Roman Catholics by birth and education can bring themselves to think that the form of religion which prevails over so large a portion of the civilised globe can be an erroneous one, or that the faith of the minority can possibly be anything but false and heretical. There is certainly something grand and imposing in numbers, which, *prima facie* at least, makes an impression on the human mind, and with many, we doubt not, stands in the stead of evidence and argument, affording, as it seems to do, a short cut towards the solution of otherwise difficult and troublesome inquiries, relieving them from the toil and anxiety of more detailed and minute conscientious examination.

Whether such *prima facie* impression be a correct one, which in the abstract can be safely confided in by any prudent and conscientious man, we have already inquired at some length in an article in our second volume, p. 40, entitled, "Are numbers a test of truth?" in which we conceive we showed not only that numbers were not a test of truth; but that even if they were, there are really more Christians who dissent from, than who conform to, the Church of Rome. We do not now propose to go again over the same ground, but rather to show upon another ground the fallaciousness of any argument derived from even apparent unanimity, when men are *compelled* to conform; when dissent is not tolerated, and, therefore, conformity is not a matter of free choice. Perhaps there is no country in Europe so exclusively Roman Catholic as Spain: how it became or remained so is the question we would consider. If it was by the enlightened choice of a free and educated people, who were too wise to be led astray by the love of heretical novelties, when Germany, England, and other nations fell away from the faith, at the period called by Protestants the Reformation, this remarkable unanimity would doubtless be a striking argument in favour of the Church of its free adoption; but if, while the inhabitants of England and Germany were (notwithstanding considerable struggles and difficulties) in the enjoyment of freedom of opinion, and able to choose for themselves, Spain was not permitted any freedom of choice in opinion, but was coerced into unanimity by the horrors and cruelties of the fires of the Inquisition, any argument from the unanimity of those who survived these fires, or had not courage to encounter them, must needs dwindle into insignificance, if it does not even turn into an argument *against* the religion of those who compelled it into existence.

We propose to give a brief account of the mode in which Protestantism was extirpated from the kingdom of